



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,704	12/06/2001	Sang-Ho Ahn	9903-045	8392

7590 06/09/2003

MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM, P.C.  
1030 S.W. Morrison Street  
Portland, OR 97205

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

TRAN, TAN N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	2826

DATE MAILED: 06/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/008,704	AHN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	TAN N TRAN	2826	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 22 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1.  A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2.  The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
  - (a)  they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c)  they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d)  they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_.

3.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5.  The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See continuation sheet
6.  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7.  For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: 20-29, 50-53 and 87-115.

Claim(s) objected to: 54 and 81.

Claim(s) rejected: 55-86.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 30-49.

8.  The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.
9.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*Minh Loan Tran*  
Minh Loan Tran  
Primary Examiner

Continuation of 5: Applicant's arguments filed 05/22/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is argued, at page 17 of the remarks, that "The thickness of Casto's inner leads that are inside the encapsulant (elements 18 and 28 of Fig.1) is not constant" and "it is impossible for Casto to simultaneously anticipate both the limitation of a second thickness greater than a first thickness and limitation of a second thickness greater than a first thickness and the limitation of a constant second thickness". However, fig.1 of Casto does show the inner leads (portion of leads 18 and 28) having a constant second thickness greater than the first thickness of lead 18 where the chip 12 is mounted. See attachment.

It is argued, at page 17 of the remarks, that "It is clear from Casto Fig.1 that the portion of the inner leads where the bonding wire 34 is connected does not have a second thickness greater than a first thickness of the chip attaching part (40)". However, fig.1 of Casto does show bonding wires 34 are indirectly connected to the portion of the inner lead 28 through the lead 18, and the inner lead having a portion (18 and 28 as shown by the attachment) that has a second thickness greater than the first thickness of lead 18 where the chip 12 is mounted. See attachment. Since claim 55 does not recite the inner leads are totally having a constant second thickness and claim 71 does not recite the bonding wires are directly connected to the portion of the inner leads, Applicant's claims 55 and 71 do not distinguish over Casto's reference.